

Remarks

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the application. On June 30, 2003, applicant mailed in its Amendment B which was received by the Patent Office on July 3, 2003. Applicant requests that the present Amendment C be entered after entry of applicant's Amendment B. Amendment C is being submitted to more clearly and appropriately define the invented subject matter.

The Examiner stated on page 11 of her most recent Office action, with regard to allowable subject matter, that "The best prior art of record teaches conventional reflector lamps, however they fail to teach or fairly suggest a nose chamber having a diameter of less than 1 inch." Accordingly, it is believed that independent Claim 1, which now includes the less than 1 inch limitation, is in allowable condition.

The next independent claim is Claim 15, which has been rejected over Zalar et al. in view of Bishop et al. Bishop is cited for its showing of a rectangular opening 130 at the bottom of the reflector in which a lamp socket is mounted. In Bishop, the opening 130 is merely a rectangular hole while in the present invention there is taught a rectangular or elliptical chamber having an inner surface. The inner surface of the chamber provides a surface upon which can be disposed a reflective coating; Bishop does not provide a chamber of any type having an inner surface upon which can be disposed a reflective coating. Claim 15 has been specifically amended to define over the applied references. Specifically, Claim 15 now requires that the reflector lamp having a nose chamber wherein "said nose chamber having an inner surface and a bottom, said nose chamber defining a slot having a major dimension and a minor dimension, said major dimension being substantially longer than said minor dimension." Bishop does not provide a nose chamber of any sort and certainly not a nose chamber having an inner surface. Furthermore, Bishop does not provide a nose chamber which "define[s] a slot having a major dimension and a minor dimension, said major dimension being substantially longer than said minor dimension." Furthermore, Bishop clearly does not provide the last limitation of Claim 15 which is "said wire lamp extending into said slot". Thus Claim 15 as now presented defines over the applied references. It is also noted that Zalar has no need for the rectangular opening of Bishop since, according to Bishop, the only reason for the rectangular opening is to permit the filament of the wire lamp to be aligned along the central axis of the glass shell (col. 4 lines 29-32); Zalar does not need this since, as shown in fig. 1 of Zalar, the filament is already aligned along the central axis of the glass shell. Since Zalar's filament is already aligned along the central axis, there is no need for any modification to permit alignment along the central axis. This shows that there is no need to combine, and no motivation to combine, the two references. Accordingly, it is clear that Claim 15, as now amended, defines over the applied references.

The next independent claim is Claim 20. With reference to this claim, it is currently rejected over Ooms (U.S. Patent 5,506,464). Claim 20 has now been amended to clearly define over this reference. Claim 20 now requires that the opening (see opening 66 of applicant's figs. 10 and 12) in the overhang portion have "a longitudinal dimension along a longitudinal axis and a lateral dimension along a lateral axis, said longitudinal dimension being longer than said lateral dimension". This clearly defines over Ooms because, in Ooms, the opening in the overhang portion is circular, see fig. 1 at 6. It can also be seen from the drawings why the opening in Ooms is circular while applicant has defined his to have a longitudinal dimension which is longer than the lateral dimension. The reason is that (see fig. 11) applicant must take his top lead 70 from the top of the wire lamp 36 back down through the opening 66. This can be seen most clearly in fig. 11 where the top lead 70 comes back through the opening 66 towards the lamp base. In Ooms, on the other hand, with reference to fig. 1 of Ooms, it can be seen that the top lead in Ooms (15, 17 and 9) does not come back through the opening at the base of the shell but rather goes out through the side of the shell as shown in Ooms fig. 1 at 9. Accordingly, Ooms does not have any need to provide an opening for his top lead to come back down through the base, while applicant, in fig. 11, does do so. Accordingly, Ooms clearly teaches away from the opening "[having a] longitudinal dimension [which is] longer than said lateral dimension". Accordingly, it is demonstrable that Claim 20 as now set forth clearly defines over Ooms.

All the remaining claims are dependent claims, and accordingly should be allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. It is believed that all the claims are now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees required by this communication, please charge any such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 32576 (LD11288).

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: John P. Murtaugh  
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

526 Superior Avenue East  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484  
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 17, 2003